



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,327	01/28/2004	Guerino G. Sacripante	118410	9875
27074 7590 09/22/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC. P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
FLETCHER III, WILLIAM P				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/22/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27074@oliff.com  
jarnstrong@oliff.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/765,327

**Applicant(s)**

SACRIPANTE ET AL.

**Examiner**

William P. Fletcher III

**Art Unit**

1792

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 22-35 and 37-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-11, 13, 22-35, 37, 39 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 3, 12, 38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see the request for reconsideration, filed after final on August 12, 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-13, 22-35, and 37-40, under 35 USC 103(a), set forth in the Office action mailed May 19, 2008, have been fully considered and are persuasive. One skilled in the art would not have been motivated to utilize particles having the GSD taught by Sacripante in either the prior art process disclosed by Applicant or the process disclosed by Nagel, for the reasons set forth in Applicant's arguments. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Lowrie (US 2,803,177 A).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 4-11, 13, 22-35, 37, 39, and 40, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sacripante et al. (US 5,593,807 A) in view of Lowrie (US 2,803,177 A), and *vice versa*.

A. As noted in the prior Office actions, Sacripante teaches all of the claimed limitations regarding the composition and method of making the claimed particles. Applicant has not traversed this position.

B. Sacripante suggests the use of those particles as toner particles in electrophotographic printing processes, including xerographic printing processes [1:6-8 and 16-19; 2:9 ff.]. Consequently, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have utilized these particles as toner particles in such a process.

C. Lowrie is a reference from the well-established xerographic printing art providing evidence that such a process involves the use of a conductive printing plate (i.e., aluminum) to which a layer has been applied (i.e., selenium). The process disclosed by Lowrie at 1:19-32 details how the powder toner particles are adhered to the surface; thereby satisfying the claimed limitation "applying a powder to a conductive surface or to a layer on said surface to form a coating on said surface or layer."

D. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Sacripante so as to utilize the toner particles in the process of Lowrie. In the alternative, it

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the Lowrie so as to utilize, as the toner particles, the particles of Sacripante. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to do either by the suggestion in Sacripante that the particles are suitable for use as toner particles in a xerographic printing process. Consequently, one skilled in the art would have had a desire and expectation of successfully providing a xerographic print utilizing the toner particles of Sacripante.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 2, 3, 12, and 38, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The process of xerographic printing involves the subsequent transfer of the image from the printing plate to another substrate, such as paper, followed by fusing, curing, etc. As such, the references of record neither teach nor suggest the limitations recited in these claims.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Fletcher III whose telephone number is (571) 272-1419. The examiner can normally be reached on Sunday, 5:00 AM - 12:00 PM and Monday through Friday, 5:00 AM - 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy H. Meeks can be reached on (571) 272-1423. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/William Phillip Fletcher III/**  
Primary Examiner

September 14, 2008